

## REMARKS

The above Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed March 25, 2008. Claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-39, 41, 42, and 45-47 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-39, 41, 42, and 45-47. The present response amends claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 19, 31, and 45-47, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-39, 41, 42, and 45-47. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **I. Information Disclosure Statement**

The information disclosure statement filed on September 21, 2007, fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Specially, no copies of the non-patent literature documents numbered 108-115 (and the two unnumbered documents following 115) have been received. Applicant respectfully submits that copies of the non-patent literature documents numbered 108-115 are provided accordingly.

### **II. Objection to Abstract**

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of legal phraseology. The Examiner has suggested that the last two sentences of the Abstract be deleted. Applicant has made the correction to the Abstract and respectfully request that it be reconsidered.

### **III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101**

Claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-39, 41, 42, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended now conforms to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections – 35 US § 112**

Claims 6 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended now conforms to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **V. Claim Rejections – 35 US § 103**

Claims 1-13, 15-27, 29-39, 41, 42 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) and (c) as being anticipated by Bau, III, *et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0005181 in view of Beged-Dov, *et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174241.

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to further limit “*the enhanced compiler operate to automatically create, deploy and manage at least one security type using the annotated source code without requiring knowledge of specifications of the at least one security type.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that Beged-Dov merely discloses the general concept of a security type such as user identity. (Paragraph **[0019]**) However, Beged-Dov does not teach using an enhanced compiler to automatically create, deploy or manage at least one security type using annotated source code without requiring knowledge of specifications of the at least one security type that can decrease the time, knowledge, skill and ultimately cost required to develop security capabilities into Web services.

Hence, independent claim 1 should be in allowable condition. Therefore, dependent claims 2-13, and 15-18 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition, at least for the same reason as stated above.

In addition, independent claims 19, 31, 45-47 are all similarly amended. Therefore, independent claims 19, 31, 45-47, as well as dependent claims 20-27 and 29-30 which are based on allowable independent claim 19; and dependent claims 32-39 and 41-42 which are based on allowable independent claim 31 should all be in allowable condition.

## **VI. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 27, 2008

By: Kuiran (Ted) Liu/  
Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

**Customer No. 23910**  
FLEISLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800